

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant acknowledges receipt of the Final Office Action dated September 14, 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11, and 13-18 as anticipated by *Lohbeck* (WO 9956000), rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, and 17 as anticipated by *Endoh*; and rejected claims 10 and 19 as obvious over *Lohbeck* in view of *Gilleland*.

Applicants have amended the claims and respectfully traverse the rejections for the reasons set out below.

Claim Rejections over *Lohbeck*

Claim 1 has been amended to require that the cavities are formed by longitudinal slits in the wall of the tubular, which distinguishes them over the teachings of *Lohbeck*, which teaches that the tubular is made of "a series of axial tubules" and requires that "the tubules 3 are sintered, welded or brazed together along the length of the areas 5 where the tubules 3 touch each other." By contrast, the tubular of the present invention can be made from single-wall tubular without requiring any joining steps. Because *Lohbeck* expressly teaches the advantages of a tubular that is assembled from multiple tubules, *Lohbeck* does not render obvious the presently claimed invention.

Claims 2-19 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore distinguishable over *Lohbeck* for the reasons set out above with respect to claim 1.

Claim Rejections over *Endoh*

Similarly, both the amendment that requires that the cavities be "formed by longitudinal slits in the wall of the tubular" and the amendment 1 to require that the tubular includes "at least one cavity that extends along less than the circumference of the tubular" distinguish it from *Endoh*. *Endoh* relates to a

method for lining underground utility pipes and describes a technique in which a external film tube 11 is reversed into a tubular liner 1. If, as asserted by the Examiner, the claimed "wall layers" are formed by elements 1 and 11, the "cavity" that is formed between them extends around the entire circumference of the device. Because of the way in which the film tube 11 of *Endoh* is reversed (inverted) into the liner 1, it would not be obvious, or even possible, to provide multiple chambers around the circumference. Thus, claim 1 as amended is distinguishable over *Endoh*.

Claims 2-19 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore distinguishable over *Endoh* for the reasons set out above with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion

Applicant has addressed each and every objection and ground for rejection. The amended claims are patentable over the cited art and Applicant requests that the application be allowed. In the event the Examiner has any questions or there are any issues with respect to the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number below prior to the issuance of any written action.

Respectfully submitted,
Wilhelmus C. M. Lohbeck

P.O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463

By /Marcella D. Watkins/
Attorney, Marcella D. Watkins
Registration No. 36,962
(713) 241-1041